Minute order Form (06/27)

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge		Milton I. Shadur		Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge						
CASE NUMBER		02 C 3595		DATE	7/3/2	7/3/2002				
CASE TITLE			John Marozas vs. City of Burbank, et al							
[In the following box (a of the motion being pre) indicate the party filing the motion, e.g., plaintiff, defendant, 3rd party plaintiff, and (b) state briefly the nature esented.]								
DOCKET ENTRY:										
(1)	☐ Filed	Filed motion of [use listing in "Motion" box above.]								
(2)	☐ Brief	Brief in support of motion due								
(3)	□ Answ	Answer brief to motion due Reply to answer brief due								
(4)	□ Ruling	g/Hearing on	set for at	·						
(5)	□ Status	Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at								
(6)	□ Pretri	Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at								
(7)	☐ Trial[Trial[set for/re-set for] on at								
(8)	□ [Benc	[Bench/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued to at								
(9)		This case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to] ☐ FRCP4(m) ☐ General Rule 21 ☐ FRCP41(a)(1) ☐ FRCP41(a)(2).								
[Other docket entry] Enter Memorandum Opinion and Order. This Court sua sponte strikes the existing answers from the file physically (thus eliminating wholly needless bulk) and grants leave to defendants to file a single collective Answer on or before July 17, 2002.										
(11)	For f	urther detail see orde	r attached to the orig	inal minute order.]						
	No notices required, a	dvised in open court.	•			Document Number				
	No notices required.				number of notices	Section 1				
Notices mailed by judge's staff. Notified counsel by telephone.					JUL 0 8 2002					
Docketing to mail notices.					date docketed					
Mail AO 450 form.				- LOUVISIO'S	docketing deputy initials					
Copy to judge/magistrate judge.			7.5	S. DISTRICT COUF	7/3/2002					
SN d		courtroom deputy's initials	Ç	707 -3 BH S: 36	date mailed notice SN					

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

JOHN	MAROZAS,)			
		Plaintiff,)			
	v.)	No.	02 C	3595
CITY	OF BURBANK,	et al.,)))			DOCKETED
		Defendants.	ý			JUL 0'8 2002

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Even though all five defendants in this Title VII case--City of Burbank and four of its Police Department's high level officers--are represented by the same law firm, counsel has needlessly filed a separate Answer for each defendant. Quite apart from the inattention to the environment evidenced by killing so many more trees than is reasonably required (why spend more than 70 pages in reproducing each set of the multiple answers, when about a fifth of that would do the job?), that places an inordinate burden on the reader in ascertaining the respects in which the defendants share common cause, as contrasted with the areas (if any) in which they part company.

It is not at all difficult--and, as already indicated, it would be a courtesy to opposing counsel and to the Court--for defense counsel to prepare and file a <u>single</u> answer on behalf of all five defendants, collectivizing their responses where appropriate and distinguishing among their individual answers where necessary. Accordingly this Court sua sponte strikes the

existing answers from the file physically (thus eliminating wholly needless bulk) and grants leave to defendants to file a single collective Answer on or before July 17, 2002.

Milton I. Shadur

Senior United States District Judge

Date: July 3, 2002